

TO THE
HIGHER LAW,

OR

CHRIST AND HIS LAW SUPREME.

BY REV. L. SMITH,

Middlebury, Ohio.

"Let them remember they are set on thrones
"As representatives, not substitutes
"Of nations, to implead with God and man;
"Let tyrants who hate truth, or fear the free,
"Know that to rule in slavery and error,
"For the mere ends of personal pomp and power,
"Is such a sin as doth deserve a hell
"To itself sole." FESTUS.

RAVENNA, OHIO,
STAR PRINT,
1852.

Cleveland, Sept. 28th, 1852.

Rev. L. Smith,
Middlebury,

*Sir:—*Permit us to suggest that the discourse on the Higher Law, delivered by you in the Plymouth Church, in this city, on the fourth of July last, much to the edification of the audience then assembled, should have a wider circulation than can be given to it by oral delivery from the pulpit. We therefore respectfully request that you will allow the same to be published for general circulation.

H. B. SPELMAN,
B. BARKER,
J. J. LOW,
H. P. HOPKINS,
H. D. HOVEY.

THE HIGHER LAW.

TEXT.

These shall make war with the Lamb, and the Lamb shall overcome them: for he is Lord of Lords, and King of Kings; and they that are with him are called, and chosen, and faithful."—Rev. 17: 14.

The *nature* and *position* of Jesus Christ, are matters of Revelation. Men may be competent witnesses of his appearance on earth, of the facts and events of his life. They can testify to what they have seen and heard of him. Here their competency ends, and revelation begins. It is ours then to pause on the limit of human knowledge, and study the teachings of inspiration respecting Christ—to listen to his voice as it discloses the *eternity* of his nature, and the *sovereignty* of his position.

We take, then, the sacred Scriptures as our light—as the only true exponent of the being and reign of Christ.

Starting from this point, I proceed to the discussion of the following topics, and bespeak in their behalf a candid perusal.

I. The Supremacy of Christ.

II. The Subordinate nature and position of Human Government.

I. The Supremacy of Christ.

"What think ye of Christ?" What position does he occupy, and with what authority and power is he invested? To what is he exalted, and what is to be the result of his preferment in excellency and glory.

He was an infant once. As such, he enjoyed the fond embrace of parental affection. In conception, birth and infancy he was the object of great amazement, after we have abated all that, which, is naturally excited by the appearance of a new-born being. In childhood he was a wonder, in point of wisdom, among men of learning and of superior intelligence. He grew in wisdom and in stature, and early manhood became the master and guiding-spirit of the age in which he lived. The wisdom of his words, the righteousness of his doctrines, the kindness of his deeds, and the benevolence of the labors, privations and poverty he endured, gathered around the brow

of his manhood the glorious crown of *moral goodness*, and blessed his age with its omnipotent and sanctifying power.

1. Christ was a *man*—exceedingly great and profoundly good.

As a matter of fact, and of common consent, he was superior in every respect, to all other men. No man, not one of our race ever ascended the scale of intelligence, goodness and moral worth, to the point where he stood. Not one ever assumed and held the reign of self-government with such a changeless purpose, and steady hand as he. Not one ever attained, in this present life that high state of human and moral perfection in which he lived, labored and died. He was superior to all men.

Yet he was a man—possessing all the attributes and susceptibilities which mark and designate the human order of being. He “was made in the likeness of man.” “And being found in fashion as a man,” (Phil. 2: 7, 8) he submitted himself to the endurance of inconveniences and infirmities of the human race. For he “was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.” Heb. 4: 15.

2. Jesus Christ is *God*—the true and living Creator and Preserver of all created things.

He, as man, was created. Did he possess another than a created nature—an uncreated? He had the *form of man*. Did he bear the *image of God*? Did he possess the Attributes and Perfections of God?

“Who being in the *form of God*, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of man.”—Phil. 2: 6, 7.

“Who being the brightness of his (God’s) glory, and the express image of his (God’s) person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high.”—Heb. 1: 3.

“In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.”—John 1: 1.

“And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us and we beheld his glory,” &c.—John 1: 14.

“Who is the image of the invisible God, the first born of every creature: For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: All things were created by him, and for him. And he is before all things, and by him all things consist.”—Col. 1: 15—17.

“And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given unto us an understanding, that we may know him that is true; and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. *This is the true God*, and eternal life.”—1 John 5: 20.

“Whose are the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen.”—Rom. 9: 5.

“For in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily.”—Col. 2: 9.

If Christ be the true God, we can know it only by a super-human revelation. The human reason, however exalted it may be, is utterly incompetent, of itself, to ascertain the fact. Neither is it competent to deny it only as it shall deny the *genuineness* of the revelation that proclaims it. However, we can not labor this point now. With us—with the christian fraternity—this point is settled. We have a genuine revelation from God; and the above quoted passages contain

some of the more prominent affirmations touching the proposition we are considering.

(1.) These passages teach that Christ existed in the form of God *before* he "was made in the likeness of men."

(2.) That in that prior-state of his existence, he claimed equality with God. See Phil. 2: 6, 7, and Jno. 1: 1 & 14.

(3.) These passages not only constructively teach that Christ is God, but it is directly and unequivocally affirmed in two, or more. 1 John 5: 20—"This (Christ) is the true God." Rom. 9: 5—"Who (Christ) is over all God blessed forever"—possessing all the attributes and perfections of Jehovah. "For in him (Christ) dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." See above.

(4.) These passages teach that Christ is God, by attributing to him the great and entire work of creation. And

(5.) By affirming his existence to be *before* that of any created thing. Whoever existed before the existence of any created thing, is God. Whoever created all things, is God.

These propositions, which in effect are one, can hardly admit of a rational doubt. The sophistry of heartless atheism may seem to indicate doubt. Yet, in such a case it is quite difficult to give credit for honesty. In one of the above cited passages (Col. 1: 16, 17) both propositions are affirmed. And if affirmed distinctly and directly in one passage, it is as conclusive as if affirmed in one hundred.

One part of this passage declares that Christ is "before all things"—i. e., created things, which is its only rational meaning. The existence of Christ is here affirmed to be before that of created things. Now if Christ existed prior, in point of time, to any created thing, then he is uncreated—self-existent—God.

Again: This passage affirms that Christ created all things—that are in heaven and in earth, visible and invisible—thrones, dominions, principulities or powers, and that he upholds all things by the word of his power. Revelation opens its messages of truth to men in the following impressive language:

"In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth."

It prolongs, in clearer and fuller light the sublime strain of truthful harmony:

"In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. * * * All things were made by Him, and without him was not any thing made that was made. * * * He was in the world, and the world was made by Him, and the world knew him not. * * * And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory," &c.

"The Word made flesh," is Jesus Christ. This term "Word" is only another name for Christ. This is not doubted. By inserting this name, in the above passage, it would read; "In the beginning was Christ, and Christ was with God, and Christ was God. All things were made by Christ," &c.

But lest some should think that this savors too much of the shorthand method of reasoning, I will consider the matter somewhat in detail. The proposition under consideration is this, viz: Christ is the true God.

I shall take it for granted that an uncreated being is God. The attempt to prove so obvious a truth would be palpable folly.

Now the passages cited above attribute to Christ the entire work of creation and preservation. They present Christ to us as the person who created and upholds all things. But I ask, can a created being create and uphold in existence all created things? If so, then he created and preserves in existence himself, which is an utter impossibility, and is therefore manifestly untrue.

To this view it may be replied that, Christ belongs to a higher order of beings than man, and that he possesses the power to create, as delegated from God.

The fact of belonging to a higher order of beings, does not bring one any nearer to the possession of creative power, than if he belonged to a lower order. For, ascend the scale of created intelligences, to the highest imaginable point in greatness, there yet exists between it and that of self-existent and creative power, an incomprehensible infinitude. I conceive it to be no more difficult to delegate creative power to man, than to the highest order of created intelligences.

Again: Though God should delegate creative power to Christ, and though Christ, by virtue of that power, should create some things, yet it could not be truthfully said that he created all things, unless he created himself: for notwithstanding the power, which by supposition, he derived from God, *he* is included in the category of created things.

Once more: If he created and preserves in existence all created things, by delegated power, then, being himself created, he must have received that power before his own existence. For the creative power must necessarily be received prior to its exercise.

Such are some of the inseparable difficulties involved in any supposition which affirms that Christ is only a created being.

Christ, as man, had a beginning—was a created being. As God, he was without beginning—was “in the beginning”—“before all things”—uncreated. He was the original author of all things that had a beginning—that from nothing were made something; whether they be visibilities or invisibilities, princes, or principalities, dominions or powers; and “he is over all, God.” “He that built (created) all things is God.”

Leaving this point I pass to make some remarks

3. Showing the Nature and Extent of the authority of Christ and his precepts.

Christ considered as merely a created being, possessing superior intelligence and moral excellence, would naturally acquire notoriety—would obtain an eminence high and commanding in its influences.

But on the supposition that he is only a superior man, he could not for that reason, or because of that superiority, hold and exercise the right to teach, or command with authority. His instructions would be human—the instructions of a man, and they could be received only as such. His precepts for the government of human conduct, his expositions and applications of law, whether human or divine,

would possess no greater authority than those of any other man who should prescribe the same things, or publish the same truths.

The points, in relation to which our inquiry is instituted, are substantially these:

With what authority are the precepts of the Gospel of Christ invested, and whence do they derive that authority? Are they Law? and wherefore are they Law?

"Judge not that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged."—Matt. 7: 1, 2.

"But I say unto you, love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you."—Matt. 5: 43.

"Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets."—Matt. 7: 12.

In these, as in all similar precepts, which involve the great elements of morality, we have a specimen of the Savior's mode of teaching. The truths announced, the principles revealed, the language and manner in which they were communicated, produced the conviction in the minds of those that heard, that, while he spoke a "never man spake," he spoke "with authority"—that he spoke with authority, substantially different from that exercised by civil and ecclesiastical officials.

Did he speak with the authority of Law? And, are his injunctions invested with the dignified bearings and binding obligations of equitable Law? Or do they possess no higher authority than similar announcements, when imparted by men?

In reply I remark:

(1.) The Precepts of Christ are a just expression of the relations and obligations that exist among men.

Man, as an individual, constitutionally considered, possesses invaluable and inalienable rights. Blackstone comments on them thus:

"1. The right of personal security," which "consists in a person's legal and uninterrupted enjoyment of his life, his limbs, his body, his health and his reputation."

"2. The right of personal liberty." "This personal liberty consists in the power of locomotion, of changing situation, or removing one's person to whatever place one's inclination may direct; without imprisonment or restraint."

In another connexion he says:

"The absolute rights of man, considered as a free agent, endowed with discernment to know good from evil, and with power of choosing those measures which appear to him most desirable, are usually summed up in one appellation, and denominated the natural liberty of mankind. This natural liberty consists, properly in a power of acting as one thinks fit, without any constraint or control, *unless by the law of nature*; being a right inherent in us by birth, and one of the gifts of God to man at his creation, when he endowed him with the faculty of free-will."

"3. The right of property, which consists in the free use, enjoyment, and disposal of all his acquisitions, without any control or diminution."

These he calls "absolute rights"—given to man at his creation, by God, and subject to modifications only by the equitable regulations of civil society. On this point he uses the following emphatic language:

"For the principal aim of society is to protect individuals in the enjoyment of these absolute rights, which were invested in them by the invisible laws of na-

nure; but which could not be preserved in force without that mutual assistance and intercourse, which is gained by the institution of friendly and social communication. Hence it follows, that the first and primary end of human laws is to maintain and regulate these absolute rights of individuals. Such rights as are social and relative, result from, and are posterior to the formation of States and societies: So that to maintain and regulate these is clearly a subsequent consideration. And, therefore, the principal view of human laws is, or ought always to be, to explain, protect, and enforce such rights as are absolute, which in themselves are few and simple; and then, such rights as are relative, which, arising from a variety of connexions, will be far more numerous and more complicated."

The American Bill of rights has compressed, in one passage, the sum of man's absolute rights: "God hath created all men *free* and *equal*; and endowed them with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." (Glorious, "self-evident truths"! Thou, centuries were requisite to elaborate them from the depths in which the lust of power had buried them! But, once conceived and engraven on a nation's heart, no whims, nor shuffling of tyrants' power can drive them back to obscurity again!

But to return: Such are the absolute rights of man. Individually and constitutionally considered all men possess them. Every man conscious of the existence of these rights in himself, knows that they belong to, and are connected with the existence of every other man.

Again: Man, considered collectively, is the subject of social rights, duties and obligations. His connexion with others of similar constitutional powers, rights and destiny, invest him with new privileges and blessings, and consequently devolve on him new obligations. He can now do, considered as a member of society, what he could not as one isolated. He can now discern, respect and love the absolute rights of his equal brother. He can render to his brother—another self—what in equity he would claim from him. But what of good he can do to, and for him, in equity, he ought to do. And the obligation is reciprocal—resting upon every member of the social or organic circle—binding each to do his neighbor good, by a bond whose strength is proportioned to the ability of each. Neither is there any change, or power, which permits the unmodified existence of these organic relations of human society, competent to annihilate that obligation. The obligations created by the existence of human society, can only pass away as it ceases to be.

Our remark in the outset was this: The Precepts of Christ are the true expression of the relations and obligations that exist among men. What could be more so? Blackstone remarks on this point: "These precepts (of Divine Revelation) when revealed, are found upon comparison to be really a part of the original law of nature, as they tend in all their consequences, to man's felicity."

There can hardly be a doubt on this point in the mind of one who has made himself thoroughly acquainted with the original law of nature and the precepts of Christ. One illustration must suffice.

"Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the Law," &c.

This is as really a law of nature as it is a precept of Christ. Most clearly is it inscribed on the constitution of human society; so that

when given by the Savior, it is to be regarded as a true transcript—a genuine expression of the Divine original.

This view of the case authorizes the remark

(2.) That the Precepts of Christ are invested with the authority of the original law of nature, i. e., with the authority of absolute truth and right.

So far as the Precepts of Christ prescribe rules for the government of human conduct, they are sustained by those obligations which owe their existence to the natural conditions and relations of life, and are sustained by the sanctions of eternal truth and righteousness. Those relations are such as to demand, that course of moral conduct enjoined in the Gospel, as that which is alone right and equitable. In other words, the nature and relations of intelligent beings create the necessity for that course of moral action required in the precepts of Christ, so that they are to be regarded and received as the just exposition of their relations and obligations. Considered in such a light they have the prime authority of law. Let us pursue the question somewhat further. What is that in any enactment which is necessary to invest it with the authority of law? It must be something else than the consent of parties concerned. That consent may be given in relation to a decree, whose every element is iniquity—something else than its endorsement by some Autocrat, King, President, or Legislative body. Such endorsement may invest it with power sufficient for its execution; but this does not necessarily impart to it the authority of law. It may be utterly destitute of the omnipotent element of right. Answer: The correlated connexions of the beings concerned, must be such as to demand the regulation as a matter of equity and right. There must be a necessity, a good reason, a reason founded in justice, underlying all rules prescribed for the government of human conduct in order to invest them with the authority of law. Without this they entirely fail to possess the true idea of law, and are necessarily deprived of all moral force whatever, and their enforcement would be absolute tyranny.

But any enactment which has a good reason, a reason founded in the just and equitable relations of the parties concerned is law. It is that reason which imparts to it, its prime authority.

Hence for this same reason, the precepts of Christ, possess the genuine authority of law. They have the whole force of absolute truth and right communicate in them “enlightening the understanding,” quickening the conscience, sanctifying the sensibility, determining the will in a state of changeless devotion to the universal good of man, and the glory of God. Blackstone still comments: “As then the moral precepts of this law (the Divine) are indeed of the same original with those of the law of nature, so their intrinsic obligation is of equal strength and perpetuity.”

Christ would evidently have us receive his word as law. “He that rejecteth me and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the words that I have spoken the same shall judge him at the last day.” There is no judgment where there is no law. Judgment presupposes the existence of law, and is in accordance with it.

If the "Word" of Christ is to be the rule of judgment at the last day, it must be then that his word is law.

(3.) The Instructions and Precepts of Christ are invested with additional authority by virtue of his Divine Character and Position.

Jesus Christ is the uncreated creator of all things. He is the self-existent God—possessing all the "fullness of the Godhead." Wisdom, power, goodness, infinite and eternal. By virtue of these, his natural moral perfections, he occupies a position in fact, that is infinitely superior, in point of authoritative instruction and precept, to all teachers and rulers of human order.

In the condition of created beings, as men, occupying a position of absolute inferiority and dependency, circumscribed in every department of their natures with limited capacities, there is founded the necessity of authoritative precept, or government. That necessity is inseparably connected with their order of existence. It grows out of their inferior and dependent condition. That condition they did not create. They can not annihilate it, nor escape from it. They could as soon remodel their original constitutions, and re-establish themselves in a new order of existence. And while it remains, there will exist the omnipresent necessity for instructions, clothed with all the force of perfect truth, and invested with the authority of absolute equity. Such is man's necessity. And such is the demand, founded in that necessity.

But who is there, among the human race, or among the myriads of intelligent but finite spirits which throng the universe, that possess the requisite qualifications to meet this demand. Whoever he be, his attributes and character should be perfect in their order, and his position Supreme. They should be of such order, so infinitely perfect in their nature and character, as to be able to meet in an equitable manner all the necessities of created beings, without the possibility of a mistake whatever; and consequently, without the possibility of a righteous appeal. I repeat, who is he that in point of fact, occupies so exalted a position of supreme, natural and moral excellence? Is it man, the highest and best of our race? Does he or any fragmentary part of it, or the whole, constitute that body which shall teach, legislate, and enforce legislation with that perfection which involves no mistake; with that authority from which there can be no righteous appeal; with that adjudication which shall never need to be rehearsed?

There may be human perfection, but it has a limit. Superhuman, unlimited perfection is demanded. There may be many who are superior men; whose excellence and worth give them pre-eminence, as "Lords" and "Kings." But such is this demand of our necessities, as that it calls for one who is not only superior, but actually supreme—who is "Lord of lords, and King of kings."

Revelation points us to the Lamb as occupying that position. It proclaims in glorious language his human and divine relations and exalted perfections, "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlast

ing Father, the Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end." * * * *

Such is the significance and import of the supremacy of Christ; and such the authority of his word. He was not only man, but God. In him the characteristics of the Finite and the Infinite were combined. All the immutable elements of Divine Power, Wisdom and Goodness, together with the complete attributes of human nature, were blended in him, in truest harmony. When he spoke, he spoke not as man merely, but as God in man. He understood all truth. He, as creator of all things, possessed a perfect knowledge of the relations and design of their existence. Therefore he was competent to the perfect accomplishment of his work. He taught without error. The principles published in his "Glorious Gospel," exist in truest harmony, with the law of nature, and the original constitution of all things. He endowed each and every created existence, with its primeval constitution. He established their endlessly diversified relations. He laid the deep foundation, and built the superstructures of all things. Therefore he is the supreme head of all things. His word is absolute truth. His judgments are right. His commandments, law—the *Higher Law*—the only true *foundation* of all equitable rules of individual conduct, of social intercourse, and of all authoritative regulations of human government.

II. The subordinate nature and position of human governments.

A chapter on the nature, utility and legitimate powers of civil governments, will not be anticipated in this place. The most that will be expected, and what I feel under obligation to do, is, to speak in strict accordance with the true science of governments.

The proposition, which the subsequent remarks are intended to elucidate, is substantially this: Human governments, though invested with authority, are subordinate to the government of God, and the superior obligations of His eternal law.

The wording of this proposition does not convey the fullness of meaning intended, only as I state further, that human governments are so limited by the absolute authority of the higher law, as that they have no right whatever, to require and enforce obedience to any enactment, which contravenes its equitable principles. That it is utterly impossible, by the exercise of any powers they possess, to set aside any principle of the divine law, or abrogate aught of the obligations it imposes. That they, by the adoption of any regulation which is opposed to the immutable principles of righteousness, as law, divest themselves of all rightful authority to enforce it. And that if they enforce such unrighteous law, they expose themselves to the just retributions of God.

(1.) The subordinate nature and position of civil governments is clearly indicated by the individual and fallible nature of its component elements.

What are human governments? and what, the elements of which they are composed? I remark, we have, as the organic elements of human governments, (1.) imperfect and fallible

men; (2.) Constitutions, charters and laws as drawn out and administered by them. These are the frail materials that constitute that mighty engine of power—Government; freighted as it is with the weal or woe of the millions of earth. And can one believe, that the will of a nation, affect as its action must the interest of all concerned, is not bound by the “high behests” of the divine law? Every individual of the organic whole,—frail, imperfect and dependent,—knows, that in his individual capacity, he is bound by its holy sanctions. Reason, conscience and the voice of God press home the conviction, and constrain its confession. Bound, and accountable too, in all his actions. Everywhere, his individuality remains. His acts are those of an individual. He is under the obligations of an individual—obligations imposed by the law of God. He may assume the responsibilities of organic bodies, and become accountable for their actions. Indeed he may not be able to avoid this, but in this he acts, and can act as an individual only—and under the highest and holiest responsibilities imposed by the law of God. And this is true of every individual of a nation. A nation is made up of individuals, every one of whom is under imperative obligations to obey the word of God in every department of active life, private, social and political. Who then can comprehend the reasonableness, and feel the force of that logic which absolves a nation’s will, from the imperial obligations of the Higher Law? If all its individual elements are subject to its authority, then why not the whole?

2. The subservient relations and objects of human governments, mark their position as subordinate to a higher power.

Government is not in itself an end, such is its nature and relations, that the realization of a good is contemplated by it—a good not found in its mere existence, but beyond it, and to which it is subservient. Such is the valuableness of the end, the magnitude of the good sought, as to authorise its existence, and the exercise of appropriate powers in securing it.

It is said, not unfrequently, and with how much wisdom I need not attempt to determine, that government is founded in what is called “The social compact;” that its authority and powers are derived from, and limited by, the consent of the members of that compact, that their tacit agreement invests their regulations with the authority of law. This is the substance of the theory. If I understand it, then nothing can be further from the truth. This view presents the consent, or the will of a nation, as the foundation of law. If this is so, then whatever civil code the people consent to is law; their agreement would make it so. Then conscience and private judgement have no authoritative decisions, respecting individual conduct. Then, any enactment however flagrant and obnoxious to justice it may be, must receive unquestioned obedience. Then, any bill containing as many elements of iniquity and features of tyranny, as the notorious American Slave Bill, may be framed into law, and all opposition and disobedience to its requirements are unrighteous.

Human necessities, and not human consent, nor human will, are the foundations of government; and every form of government, that

does not grow out of the necessities of the governed is insufficient or tyrannical.

The protection of individuals "in the enjoyment of those absolute rights which were invested in them by the immutable laws of nature" is, the great good which should be contemplated in the existence of government. This is the end of human government, "to explain, protect and enforce" man's absolute rights viz: the "rights of personal protection, personal liberty and property," and there is no authority, whatever, that may deny or take away these rights from a single individual, unfortified by crime. This would be an entire perversion of the ends of government. Against this, the law of nature utters its solemn protest; and the Higher law of God proclaims its anathemas of coming retribution.

This view of human governments, showing, their subservient purposes, renders the conclusion necessary, that though they are invested with power, that power is subordinate to the power of God.

3. This view of human government is sustained by God's providential dealings with the nations of the Earth. Sufficient has already been said to indicate the truth, that nations, though *in* authority, are *under* authority. The power they possess is *derived* from above. "For there is no power but of God." Their position, however great or important, is a position of *absolute inferiority*—inferior, because dependent, and subordinate to the higher and nobler purposes contemplated in the Government of God. Yet they are slow to learn this; and unwilling to acknowledge it.

National prosperity paves the way to an overgrown national pride. Success, in the common objects of national ambition, first flatters, then ruins them—ruins them because their boasted greatness, becomes the occasion of oppressing the poor and the helpless, of overriding the grand elements of immutable law in their legislation and administration, and of repudiating the authority of God. Deeming themselves to be profoundly secure, on account of their superior wisdom, their resources of strength, and the abundance of their means of national aggrandizement, they are prone to scout the idea of any power above them. Especially is this true of those nations who have the "mere end of pomp and power" to attend to, at the expense of oppressed humanity.

Autocrats, grown great and bloated with having swallowed the rights and liberties of the people, know no superior authority to their own decrees; and proud republican officials confess no Higher Law than the *constitution* of their nation, or the *will* of the people. Their self-sufficiency is, not unfrequently, marked with monstrous recklessness and impudence. As a specimen, hear the blasphemous inquiry of the haughty autocrat of Egypt in his contempt of the idea of a Higher Power:

"Who is the Lord that I should obey *his voice* to let Israel go? I know not the Lord, neither will I let Israel go."

Who wonders, or can wonder that God should send him "quick into Hell," and that He, who had endured long their contempt of His Sovereignty, should, in the righteousness of his judgment, bury

the guilty nation in the deep grave of infamy?—And this disdainful taunt of Israel's God, from the Assyrian General in behalf of the King:

"Thus saith the great King, the King of Assyria, what confidence is this wherein thou trustest? * * * * * Let not thy God in whom thou trustest, deceive thee—saying Jerusalem shall not be given into the hand of the King of Assyria."

One hundred and eighty-five thousand of the Assyrian host, slain in one night, should make earthly Potentates tremble and shrink back from the utterance of the blasphemous thought—And this Atheistical sneer at the Higher Law, the Law of God, by a Senator of the United States Congress:

"When nothing else will answer, they invoke religion, and speak of a higher law. Gentlemen, this North Mountain is high, the Blue Ridge higher still, the Alleghany higher than either, and yet this higher law ranges further than an Eagle's flight above the highest peak of the Alleghany. [Laughter.] No common vision can discern it; no conscience not transcendental and ecstatic can feel it; the hearing of common men never learn its high behests; and therefore one should think it is not a safe law to be acted on in matters of the highest practical moment."—Daniel Webster.

This passage savors much of the sordid notions, and contemptuous cantings of the miserly wicked. "What is the Almighty that we should serve him? and what profit should we have, if we pray unto him." History has written doom of the man, and the nation that condemn the God of Heaven, and set at naught his holy Law.

Powerful nations have been dashed in pieces like a potter's vessel, because they disdained to acknowledge the Supreme authority of God and His Law. One after another have they been cast down at the command of God, because they trusted "in oppression and perverseness, and wickedly abandoned the true objects contemplated in their national existence. The highway of nations is literally thronged with the shattered fragments of powerful kingdoms and mighty empires *fallen* like Babylon; because, like her, they had become the habitation of devils, the hold of every foul spirit, the cage of every unclean and hateful bird; and because they had glorified themselves and lived deliciously, and traded in *slaves* and *souls* of men. And now, the records of their existence, magnificence and greatness, like monumental spires standing out of the vastness of their ruins, point to God as the sovereign arbiter of nations, the righteous avenger of His throne, and give a significant warning to reckless rulers and tyrannical governments that discard the imperial authority of the Higher Law.

And this has been the line of policy pursued by God in all his dealings with the nations of the earth. He has abundantly blessed the "righteous nation that keepeth the truth;" on the other hand he has "utterly plucked up and destroyed those nations" that have disdained allegiance to the mandates of His law, because of their wickedness in doing so.

In this, He assumes and maintains the position of an arbiter above them. His providences with nations clearly indicate

it. He, as a sovereign arbiter, sits in judgment upon the fact of their conformity or nonconformity to the sacred injunctions of the Higher Law; and executes its awful sanctions upon them—building up the good and dashing in pieces the evil.

How forcible the conviction that a nation's will is bound by the eternal law of right!

4. Lastly, Revelation affirms that Governments are the ordinances of God. If they are, then, they are under the authority of God and his Law, and all the powers they possess are delegated.

Human governments are of Divine appointment, not so much in form as in fact—not so much in their mode of existence as in the principles upon which they should be founded, and in accordance with which they should be administered.

Particularly, Governments are ordinances of God, as seen

(1.) In the fact that He is the author of that original constitution of things, which creates the demand for governments.

(2.) That he has established the principles of eternal rectitude, upon and by which they are to be founded and regulated.

(3.) That He has invested them with authority, and indicated the means and modes which they are to adopt in the administration of government. That a government, confined in the use of its powers, to the ends and means contemplated in God's ordinance, is God's government—is his ordinance, and is invested with ample authority for the efficient administration of its laws.

But, if a government disregards the necessities which create the demand of its existence, and discards those principles established of God, for its regulation in meeting those necessities, then it is not an ordinance of God. Upon such a government He has conferred no power. He ordained government as an instrumentality of good to the people, and not as an engine of destruction, to destroy their rights and curse their blessings. He ordained it with ample power to execute good, and resist the evil. But, not in a single instance, has He authorized it to execute evil, in resistance of the good—to smite down the unforfeited rights of a few or many, for the benefit of others.—Not in a single instance, can the power conferred on government, be rightfully exercised for the accomplishment of purposes which are hostile to the ends contemplated in the ordinance of God. Here is the charter of rights and powers invested in government by the ordinance of God.

"Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God. The powers that be, are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God. And they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? Do that which is good and thou shalt have praise of the same: for he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain. For he is a minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but for conscience's sake. For for this cause pay ye tribute also; for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues."

Macknight, comments thus on this passage :

"This admirable part of his letter, the Apostle began, with exhorting every one to obey the government of the country where he lives, whether it be established by the express consent of the people, or by their acquiescence, or by long usage; founding his exhortation on the following principle:—That God having formed mankind for living in society, and some government being absolutely necessary for maintaining order and peace among the associated, whatever form of government happens to be established in any country, is authorized of God, and is subordinate to his general government of the world. Civil government, therefore, being authorized of God, he who resists the established exercise of it in any country, on pretence that the persons holding the reins of government have no just title to do so, or on pretence that they profess a false religion, and exercise their power in supporting error, really resisteth the ordinance of God."

In this connection I will quote also from the language of a recent author.* He says:

"He (God) has himself made *all* the laws which are needful, and all which can be justly obligatory upon us in respect to *Divine Worship*—such duties as praise, prayer, preaching the Gospel, and observing the sacramental ordinances—and no human authority may either repeal these laws, or add to them. But in respect to the duties which we owe to our neighbors, that is, to our fellow-men, in any relation he holds to us, or can ever hold, God has left the most of these duties to the authoritative decision of human governments. * * * * *

Explicit Divine law regulates all the *particulars* of the one class of duties, the *particulars* of the other class of duties are left to human law, or the regulations of human society.

But this latter class of duties, that is, our social duties, are not left to the individual judgment or independent choice of men, in such a sense, that they may obey or disobey human government, just as they please. Not in the least. Human government is by Divine will. Obedience to it, is obligatory upon men, by the will and law of God. * * * * *

According to the above, whatever form of government happens to be established in any country, or the actually existing governments are the "higher powers" which the Apostle affirms are the ordinances of God; and to resist the operations of such governments, is resistance to the ordinance of God. Most manifestly those who hold and teach this, understand the requirement of subjection to mean something more than a passive submission to the sufferance of the penalties inflicted in consequence of disobeying unrighteous laws. They obviously teach—would have us understand, that the requirement devolves on the individual judgments and consciences of men the not-to-be-violated obligation of obedience to the good or bad laws of existing governments. That it is "not left to the individual judgment" to determine the question of obedience or disobedience. That God has divested himself of the responsibility of legislating respecting human duties, or has thrown off that responsibility upon human governments, and ordained them as the organic bodies which are invested with the right of God to legislate and enforce legislation with that authority which annihilates the right of obeying the dictates of private or individual judgment. Else their theory is devoid of point, and their teaching is without force. For there is no question as to the right of submitting to the infliction of penalties. No one affirms that it is wrong to submit. The question of greatest moment is, Are human governments invested with authority to that extent that they have a right to frame an unrighteous law, and can they impose on individuals the duty of obeying it? On the last part of this ques-

* See the sermon of Dr. Spencer preached in 1871, at Brooklyn, N. Y.

tion I understand the above and many like-minded authors to teach that they have authority to impose the duty of obedience; and to make individual disobedience an offence against the ordinance of God. In a word, That the requirement of subjection to the "higher powers" enforces the duty to their laws whatever may be their character.

In opposition to this obnoxious theory, respecting the duties of individuals to governments I present,

1. Those specifications, contained in the passage of scripture cited above, which define its meaning, and give it a significant bearing upon the question under consideration.

1. SPECIFICATION.

For there is no Power but of God.

The truth contained in this affirmation is assigned as a reason for yielding subjection to the "higher powers." The term "power" seems to necessarily designate either physical force, as embodied in a nation, or authority, i. e. right and ability to govern. That it does not mean the physical force of a nation is manifest from the fact that it would render the reason of subjection perfectly insignificant, as one may readily see by an examination of the passage.

The only meaning which this term can have, that will invest it with the power and significance of a reason, is that of authority.—For there is no authority but of God.

But if the authority which governments possess be of God, then their position is subordinate; and though they are a "higher power" they are not the highest—there is a power above them. Then they are limited also in their action by the original law of equity. They have no authority from God to depart, in a single instance, or in the least degree, in their legislation and enforcement of law, from the omnipresent obligations of Right. There is no power in the universe competent to grant such authority. God does not claim any such prerogative for himself. Then they, by the enactment of unrighteous laws, divest themselves, likewise, of all authority to enforce them, and to impose the duty of obedience upon their subjects. For, in whatever instances they command or legislate, without the right to do so, they transcend their authority, and therefore, can not create the obligation to obey. If they ordain the infliction of evil upon the subjects of government, by a wicked statute, as in the case of the fugitive slave law, God does not; and their ordinance is not an ordinance of God. In resisting it, one does not resist an ordinance of God.

2. SPECIFICATION.

For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil.

That government which is invested with the authority of God, and which leaves the impress of the Divine ordinance, must, in its organic elements and superstructure, be essentially righteous; else how can it be a terror to the evil and a praise to the good? According to this specification, the administration of government also, in all its departments, is to be of such a character as to surround evil deeds and evil doers with the omnipresent terrors of just retribution. Wilt thou,

then, not be afraid of the power? Do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same." The power ordained of God is a praise to them that do good, but a terror to them that do evil. But is this true of those governments whose organization is a contravention of the elements of right and justice, and the corruptions of whose administration, like an overflowing wave, drives terror home to the heart of the righteous, and breaks over the abodes of the innocent with a frightfully desolating power?

Is this the "higher power" which God has ordained, and upon which he has devolved the exclusive right of government respecting "almost the entire class" of human duties? Has he committed to its charge the consciences and "individual judgments" of the nation? Oh, how preposterous!

3. SPECIFICATION.

For he is a minister of God to thee for good.

A minister, in the true signification of the term, is an agent appointed to do business under the authority of another. An officer of government is a minister of God. As such he is ordained to execute his will—to be administrator of his goodness to men. The sword—an emblem of justice—is, of God, put into his hand for the purposes of prevention and punishment of crime. Abiding in the exercise of the appropriate functions of state, and acting clearly within the range defined and limited by his commission from Almighty God, he stands invested with the authority of the "Higher power"—the Higher Law. Occupying such a position, and being in his official character "just and fearing God," he is a minister of God, according to the true intent of the Divine ordinance. Otherwise he is not.

But according to the teaching of the "lower law" divines, he who exercises the powers of government in such a manner as to contravene the precepts of virtue, and the ends of justice, in such a manner as to violate all these specifications which define and limit his authority, as derived from God—he who contemptuously repudiates the "higher law," and the sovereignty of Jehovah, in his subserviency to the dictates of oppression, overriding and trampling down the rights and best interests of a nation, to seize the emoluments of office and the honors of state, is a minister of God! Though he use the terrific power, secured to him by virtue of his office, in pouring out vials of wrath upon the innocent and the good, and in protecting the vicious from merited retribution, yet he is a ruler clothed with the authority of God! However notorious for wickedness he may be, in the exercise of governmental prerogatives, however pernicious in his private and official character—he may be a *Nero in crime*, yet, in the lower law school, he is the embodiment of the "higher power," ordained of God, and subjection to Him, without the right of dissent or obedience to "individual judgment," is the required and absolute duty of the subject of government! Cut upon such dogmas! Drawn up, as this theological-political creed unquestionably is, to strengthen the hands of wicked rulers, in the execution of the most perfidious law that ever disgraced the annals of any age, a law that has driven more than eight thousand souls, from this "land of the free," into

wretched exile, and that has seized scores of persons, who had fled to us for protection from the oppressors cruelty ; and returned them in opposition to the law of God,* loaded with chains and disgrace to the damning hell of southern slavery. Such a creed, drawn up for such purposes, deserves the execration of mankind. And the effort to drag—on this passage of the sacred oracles, flashing terror and wrath along the pathway of evil minded magistrates as it does into the service of wicked rulers is an error, which, like that of Elphaz, cannot escape the Divine indignation and rebuke.

2. Again, I present *several instances of individual disobedience to unrighteous law's as sanctioned by the approving providence of God.*

(1) INSTANCE—SHIPRAH AND PUAH.

The King of Egypt had commanded these women, (midwives,) to kill all the new born male children of the Hebrews. Pharaoh was invested with the authority of God to execute his command, tho' wicked, as really as the President of the United States was in giving his sanction to the fugitive slave bill. And further—These women were bound by the King's command, to sacrifice their "individual judgment" touching points of equity and individual duty, and to yield unquestioned obedience to his mandate ; just as the people of the north are bound under the fugitive law, at the instigation it may be of a most abandoned wretch with a heart filled with lust and hands reeking with the blood of slaughtered innocence, to surrender the escaped slave, even though a kin,† to the wretched doom of perpetual slavery.

These women moreover had no right to rebel against the authority of the King. To do this, was actual rebellion against the authority of God ; unless they had a "fair prospect of successful resistance—of an overthrow of the government," and "of the firm establishment of a better government."‡ Then, indeed, their rebellion against the tyrant would be obedience to God. But otherwise, to obey God they must be in subjection to the tyrant and to his awful decree. So runs the modern theory concerning the duty of individuals to governments.

MARK THE SEQUEL.

"But the midwives feared God, and did not as the king of Egypt commanded them, but saved the men-children alive." * * *

"Therefore God dealt well with the midwives."—[Ex. 1. 17 20.

(2) INSTANCE—SHADRACH, MESHACH, AND ABER-NEGO.

Nebuchadnezzar had made an image and set it up in the province of Babylon. By his herald he had commanded the people, at a given signal to fall down and worship it.

The multitude obediently bowed down in worship before the senseless idol. These three, Hebrew servants, refused to obey. The King was informed, and in rage, commanded them before him. He

*Thou shalt not deliver unto his master, the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee. He shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose, in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best. Thou shalt not oppress him.—Deut. 23: 15, 16.

†Dr. Dewey.

‡See sermon by Dr. Spencer, preached in Brooklyn 1850.

remonstrated with them, and repeated his command, with the penalty of disobedience annexed.

In reply to the king :

"Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-nego, answered and said, O, Nebuchadnezzar, we are not careful to answer thee in this matter. If it be so, our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace, and he will deliver us out of thy hand, O king. But if not, be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image thou hast set up."—Dan. 3: 16-18.

The presence of a mightier prince than the king of Babylon—"the King of kings and Lord of lords," shielded these men from the hurt of fire. Their deliverance by him, from death in its most terrific form, as intended by the king, must be regarded as a token of the divine approbation sanctioning their disobedience to the existing powers.

(3.) INSTANCE—DANIEL.

After the destruction of Babylon, Daniel was carried into Media, by Darius, King of the Medo-Persian Empire. Darius had placed over the officers of the nation, one hundred and twenty princes, and over the princes, three presidents, of whom Daniel was first. His appointment as first president, excited the jealousy of the other presidents and princes. They therefore sought occasion for effecting his removal from office. This was difficult, inasmuch as he was without "error or fault." They, however, obtained a decree, signed by the King, that whosoever should ask a petition of any God or man for thirty days, save of the King, he should be cast into the den of lions.

Daniel was a man of prayer. The conspiracy against him sought to take advantage of this habit, in order to effect his destruction.—They succeeded so far as to secure the adoption of a law which forbade prayer for thirty days. Educated in the "school of the Prophets," confirmed in his belief in the existence of an omnipresent God, and being a man of ardent and devoted piety, Daniel disdained the unrighteous law. Therefore, "He went into his house; and his windows being open in his chamber toward Jerusalem, he kneeled upon his knees, three times a day, and prayed and gave thanks before his God, as he did at first." The circumstances surrounding the Prophet were such as to render it not a difficult task to have suggested a method of escaping the peril of disobedience. The spirit of 1850 could have invested the powerful monarch with the authority of God, and have surrendered freedom of conscience and the right of private judgment, to him, and comforted himself with worshipping God mentally. Thus he might have escaped the painful peril of losing his life. But nay, he bowed in prayer, according to his daily custom.

The sequel is known. He was cast into the den of lions, was preserved and restored to his place in the kingdom.

In response to the call of King Darius, and from the midst of cowering lions, Daniel says:

"My God hath sent his angel and shut the lion's mouths, that they have not hurt me; forasmuch as before Him, innocency was found in me, and also before thee, O King, have I done no hurt."

This justification on the ground of innocence, was no vain boast in Daniel. He was most triumphantly exculpated of all guilt by his deliverance from death, wrought out by the hand of God.

The three cases I have cited, occurring as they did, under the reign of three of the most powerful monarchs, tests most clearly the right of individual rebellion against unrighteous law. The highest authority of these empires had been invested in their edicts. If any wicked law, of any nation whatever, could possibly be invested with the authority of God, then these were.

But God has marked wicked law with his seal of condemnation, by sanctioning *individual* rebellion. Most emphatically is it shown that governments, by the enactment of wicked laws, divest themselves of all authority to enforce them. Most emphatically is it shown too, that they have no authority whatever, to set aside the obligations imposed by the law of God, by their commandments. Verily, Daniel alone, erect and God like in his innocency, was invested with a higher authority in respect to the point at issue, than the whole Medo Persian Empire. For it quailed before the power of his dissent.

The above specifications and instances, are introduced for the purpose of showing, from the nature of government as an ordinance of God, and from the right of individual rebellion against unrighteous law, the fact that human governments are subordinate to the law and authority of God, and in what sense they are so. My work in this respect is accomplished.

Behold the Lamb. "*For above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come.*" Invested with supreme authority, his kingdom is destined to prevail, and to "put down all rule and all authority and power."

The mighty power of his "glorious Gospel" is destined to permeate all hearts, and all the avenues of human society, even to their utmost extremities; loosing the chords of wickedness; throwing off the grievous burdens of individual, social and national wrong; uprooting and utterly exterminating all the gigantic forms of oppression and unrighteousness, which have burdened the world with woes, and to re-establish human hearts, political and ecclesiastical institutions in the order and harmony of Heaven. "He must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet, for he is "Lord of Lords, and King of Kings."

TOPICS OF REMARK—I. SLAVERY.

Slavery is an unnatural condition of life. It takes a human being, places a *property valuation* upon his body and soul, and treats him as an article of merchandize. The physical force of the slave, or his capacity for gratifying the wanton lusts and selfish propensities of the master, is the standard of valuation.

Life, liberty, happiness, intelligence, virtue and piety all sink to this standard—are weighed in these balances. In this, all the absolute and relative rights invested in human existence, God's gift to man, are denied and stricken down. In such a state, God's image is reported and judged to be property; and is held and treated as property only. Slavery, then, must necessarily be a forced state of society, being op-

posed, as it ever is, to the native instincts, the natural rights, the moral sentiments and impulses of mankind. It can exist only by statutory enactments, sustained by the supreme force of the state or nation.

Such in theory is slavery. But considered as a *fact*, its endlessly, varied, and enormous wrongs exceed our highest conceptions. It can only be known, as its severity and cruelty, are felt.

Such being the nature and character of slavery, it is utterly impossible to invest the statutes that define and describe its condition with the elements and sanction of law. The marauding, banditti's code possesses as really the elements of law, as does the code of the slave holder. The rules of plunder, or the articles of agreement whereby the rights of any class of men are invaded and destroyed are not only not law, totally devoid of the first principles of law, but they are directly the opposite of all law. They are arrayed against every element and department of law, and cannot possibly exist where law is maintained. Just as darkness is the opposite of light, and evil the opposite of good. View in this light, the slaveholding code are merely and only articles of agreement for plundering purposes. This is the true judgment in the case, as determined by the intelligent and honest convictions of the world and the testimony of God. Slaveholders themselves know that this is true. Doubtless they would thus judge, and not hesitate to proclaim it respecting any code whereby they should be made the subjects of such horrible oppression.

Hence is seen, the abhorrent wickedness of the entire slaveholding system. If we contemplate the direct action and results of slavery, as exhibited in the unutterable wrongs, perpetrated upon the three and a half millions of slaves in our land; or if we contemplate the inherent iniquity of the measures employed in the accomplishment of this fearful work of ruin; or if we contemplate the wider range slavery has taken, dragging into its service the wealth and power of our nation; spurning alike the rights of freemen and the slave; grasping after more territory for its extension, more subjects for its fiendish indulgence, higher power for its maintenance and protection; in whatever light we look at it, it is seen to be alike abhorrent for its iniquity.

II.—SLAVE CATCHING.

Slavery, I have said, is a forced state of society. The oppressed of our land are reduced to a state of life which is totally repugnant to every constitutional propensity and noble faculty of their being. Likewise the forceful instrumentalities and violent measures by which their degrading condition is perpetuated, are justly obnoxious to them. Human nature throttled, groans, and writhes in pain, and lifts up her agonized cry for deliverance. Therefore they would escape. They would drink the sweet water of liberty, and regale themselves amid the delightful breezes of the land of freedom.

But the foul spirit of slavery watches, hawk eyed, its victims, and guards the avenues to freedom with fearful peril. Hence, our nation is woefully cursed with what is called, in mockery of law, the **FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW**, in which we, as a nation, have entered into "an agreement with Hell" and the slaveholders. In this act two

things are worthy of note. (1.) The business. (2.) The manner of its accomplishment. The act proposes to prevent the escaping of men from slavery to freedom; or to catch them if escaped, and return them to slavery again. It proposes to do this by laying under contribution to it, the wealth and power of our nation. In the adoption of this act the nation consented to the slaveholders proposition, and agreed to use its mighty resources, as occasion required, in the iniquitous work of slave-catching. By this act the local wickedness of the South, is *nationalized*. The statutory enactments of southern states, by which slaves and their condition are defined and established, thrust out their snakish head and neck throughout the entire north and west. They follow the fleeing fugitive to the utmost limits of the nation, with their fiery, fiendish eye, and hisses of death, *—every inch* of its territory is surrendered to slavery—is cursed with its hideous deformities and its awful guilt. The spirit of slavery, like the angry storm-cloud, hangs in blackened folds of wrath over the land, and threatens vengeance to any or all who dare resist its deadly movements. By this act “every good citizen” is forbidden to administer aid and comfort to escaped slaves, and is commanded to assist in their recapture and return. The nation has commanded this. It is in “agreement with hell” and slaveholders to-day, to inflict unrelenting penalties upon those faithful men and women, who, from the higher impulses of conscience, the religion of Christ, and the love of God, disdain obedience to its edicts of iniquity.

We hate slavery, because in its every element and aspect it is unutterably wrong. It can exist only in violation of every principle of right and equity, every attribute of justice, and every requirement of God. But can we love the Fugitive Act—can we tolerate it more than *slavery* itself? Is it not a *re-establishment* of slavery? If by the *mis-use* of our influence we permit the existence of slavery, are we not accessories to its enormities?

But, in this act, we (the nation,) do more than *tolerate*; we aid and abet the man thief to catch and carry off his victims, *defraying his expenses*. We are, most directly, *accomplices*. Nay more—we offer to petty miscreants, for the work of turning freemen over to the unmerciful cruelties of slavery, a NATIONAL BRIBE!!

We say to them, for your services in depriving men of their inalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness—in throttling the native instincts of the human constitution for freedom—in crushing the noble aspirations of the soul for intelligence, virtue, happiness and the bliss of immortality, and in violating the law of God, and resisting his ordinances—for your services in this warfare against humanity and the “Lamb,” you shall receive the award—*ten dollars*.

But if you obey the dictates of our common humanity, the teachings of our celestial christianity, enrolling your names upon the side of the “Lamb” with the “called and the chosen and the faithful,” opposing the dark spirit and dreadful work of Slavery, by delivering the escaped up to freedom, then five dollars shall be your remuneration.

Five dollars for Freedom, and Ten Dollars for Slavery! or a bid of five dollars for depriving a human being of the God-given boon of freedom!! Oh my country, how art thou fallen! And canst thou descend to deeper depths of disgraceful wickedness? Is it possible? Perhaps—in the attempts to “discountenance” and “resist” the *agitation* of this infamous, anti-human compromise, by the political and national organizations of our country. And is it not enough that we have tolerated the existence of slavery in the south? Must we yield up the choicest treasures of our national prosperity, to the all-devouring spirit of slavery? Love as we do, the republican name and spirit—jealous as we are of our liberty-loving reputation abroad—sympathising as we do, or ought, in the efforts of the friends of freedom in Europe, endeavoring to throw off the grievous yoke of despotism; must we bow to the tyrant, receive his chains and say, “do with us as seemeth thee good,” we are ready for thy bidding. Must we deny our love of truth, of the noble sentiments of our Declaration of Independence, and respect for the law of God! Must we throw off our coat of Liberty, cast away our weapons of Freedom; roll up our sleeves and unite with the slaveholding minions of the south, in erasing the foundation and superstructure of our Republic, and build the throne of iniquity upon the tears, and groans, and blood, and slaughtered victims of unrighteous oppression! Must we join the slave-hunt, run down freedom, and drag outraged innocence back to the doom of perpetual slavery; with hearts steeled and lips fast-closed against the “agitation and utterance of the deep convictions of our souls! In the name and behalf of truth and of humanity; and in the fear of God, I do must sacredly protest and remonstrate against this Legion of Iniquity and its work

(3.) OUR DUTY.

The usurpations and encroachments of the slaveholding power upon the rights and interests of freedom, *should* be resisted by a resolve, rooted and established in the principles of right. As individuals, exercising personal influences, as members of society possessing political power and moral responsibilities, we are sacredly bound to seek the correction and purification of the popular sentiments, the enactment and administration of righteous law. We must have, *duty calls* for a government established and administered upon such principles as “to constitute it an ordinance of God,” a “Higher Power.” As philanthropists, and as christians we are bound by the “Higher Law” of God to repudiate those political and ecclesiastical parties which have established themselves upon, or in harmony with the principles and dictates of the Fugitive Slave Act. It ought to be overthrown. *It must be.* It, with all its abettors are engaged in war upon the “Lamb,” and the hallowed rights and interests he represents. Enrolling our names with the “called and chosen and faithful” upon the “Lamb’s book of life,” or engaging in his work of regenerating human society we ought, we must repudiate them.